

Appl. No. 10/807,973
Amdt. Dated 08/15/2005
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the Office Action, claims 1, 6, 7, 8 and 19 have been carefully amended, claims 7 and 20 presented as new claims 31 and 32, and the embodiment of Figure 5 has been claimed in new claims 27-30. Claim 5 has been canceled.

Claim 1 has been carefully amended to make clear that the gates of the first and second NMOS devices are biased at different voltages, contrary to the disclosure of Randazzo. The advantages of doing this are explained in the application, and clearly distinguishes over Randazzo, which shows the gates being connected together and to a reference voltage.

Claim 6, now dependent on claim 1, has been amended to state that the bias control provides biases on the gates of the first and second NMOS devices so that the bias on the gate of the second NMOS device minus the bias on the gate of the first NMOS device is a function of the gate source voltage of the second NMOS device to compensate for variations in temperature and processing. Randazzo clearly fails to disclose providing biases on the gates of the first and second NMOS devices so that the bias on the gate of the second NMOS device minus the bias on the gate of the first NMOS device is a function of the gate source voltage of the second NMOS device to compensate for variations in temperature and processing. Accordingly, reconsideration of the rejection of this claims is respectfully requested.

With respect to claims 14 through 19, reconsideration of the rejection of these claims is also respectfully requested. Claim 14 claims a source follower, contrary to Randazzo. Randazzo has no source follower input connection, only a reference voltage connection, and no source follower output connection. In that regard, Randazzo has a single connection to the source of device 48, not two connections as required by claim 14.

Claim 19 has been amended in a manner similar to claim 6, and is believed now allowable as depending on an allowable claim and for the reasons given for claim 6.

New claims 27 through 30 claim the embodiment of Figure 5, clearly neither disclosed nor rendered obvious by Randazzo. Finally, new claims 31 and 32 present original claims 7 and 20, originally merely objected to, in independent form.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all claims remaining in the case are now allowable.

Appl. No. 10/807,973
Amdt. Dated 08/15/2005
Reply to Office Action of March 15, 2005

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 08/15/2005

By Roger W. Blakely
Roger W. Blakely, Jr.
Reg. No. 25,831
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)

12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8A)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

MAILING

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service
as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:
Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: 08/15/2005

FACSIMILE

☒ transmitted by facsimile to the Patent and
Trademark Office.

Jessica A. Clark
Jessica A. Clark

8/15/2005
Date